

Sir:

PATENT Customer No. 22,852 Attorney Docket No. 05725.0877

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re A	Application of:
David	W. CANNELL et al.
Applic	ation No.: 09/820,856
Filed:	March 30, 2001
For:	HEAT ACTIVATED DURABLE STYLING COMPOSITIONS COMPRISING C <sub>1</sub> TO C <sub>22</sub> SUBSTITUTED C <sub>3</sub> -C <sub>5</sub> MONOSACCHARIDES AND METHODS FOR SAME
Comm	nissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450	
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	

Group Art Unit: 1615

Examiner: J. Venkat

Notice of Allowance Dated: April 16, 2004

Mail Stop Issue Fee

Confirmation No.: 7050

## **COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the Notice of Allowability and Statement of Reasons for Allowance dated April 16, 2004. Without withdrawing the claims from issue, Applicants submit these comments to clarify the scope of the present claims.

In the Notice of Allowability, the Examiner provided a Statement of Reasons for Allowance in which U.S. Patent 6,486,105 "is cited to show the art." According to the Examiner:

The difference between the patent and the instant application is that the instant compounds are substituted monosaccharides and the monosaccharides in the patent are useful for treating keratin fibers where as the instant substituted monosaccharides are useful for durable non-permanent shaping or durable retention of non-permanent shape.

Attorney Docket No. 05725.0877

**Application No.: 09/820,856** 

Applicants respectfully note that U.S. Patent 6,486,105 is owned by Applicants'

assignee and has the same filing date as the present application, i.e., March 30, 2001.

Thus, the '105 patent is not prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse the

Examiner's characterization of the state of the art by using the disclosure of the '105

patent.

Moreover, in the above passage, the Examiner characterizes "the difference"

between the alleged art and the present claims. Applicants respectfully note that in the

aggregate, the allowed claims have numerous limitations that distinguish it from the art.

Thus, there is no single difference between the claimed invention and the art.

Accordingly, Applicants traverse the Examiner's statement regarding the present

invention to the extent that the Examiner improperly characterizes the invention.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,

GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated:

July 8, 2004

r: <u>Mane band</u> Maria T. Bautista

Reg. No. 52,516